



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/797,037	03/11/2004	Yasuaki Nozawa	0171-1068P	4654
2292	7590	04/03/2006	EXAMINER	
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747				NECKEL, ALEXA DOROSHENK
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		1764		

DATE MAILED: 04/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Cir

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/797,037	NOZAWA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Alexa D. Neckel	1764	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 January 2006.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date, _____.   |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.                                   |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Klebe et al. (4,503,092) in view of OHTA et al. (2002/0155256).

With respect to claims 1 and 2, Klebe et al. discloses an apparatus for the hydrophobization of pyrogenically produced silica comprising:

a means for pyrolyzing/burner, (1) to form silica;  
a coagulation zone/means for agglomerating, (2);  
a series of cyclones (4, 5, 6);  
a fluidization vessel (11) which can hydrophobize and deacidify (col. 3, lines 35-36); and

a suction line (13) which feeds fluidization vessel (11) waste gases to a second cyclone (8).

The suction line (13) will reduce the pressure and thereby cool the stream prior to its separation. See OHTA et al. (page 3, paragraph 0042) for evidence that such pressure reduction of the reaction gases from pyrogenically prepared silica will result in a temperature of 100-160°C.

Klebe et al. fails to disclose wherein the apparatus also comprises filters.

OHTA et al. teaches that pyrogenically prepared silica can be separated from waste gases by filter or cyclone. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to also provide filters along with the cyclones in the device of Klebe et al. in order to achieve a desired level of separation as well as since filters are recognized by OHTA et al. as known separation means for pyrogenically prepared silica.

Claims 3-8 are directed only to a manner of operating the claimed device. The manner of operating a device does not differentiate apparatus claims from the prior art. MPEP 2114. Therefor, claims 3-8 continue to read on the device of Klebe et al. in view of OHTA et al. as applied to claims 1 and 2 above.

***Response to Arguments***

**Specification**

The objection to the specification is withdrawn due to applicant's amendment.

**35 USC 103**

Applicant argues that Klebe fails to disclose or teach that a fluidization system is divided into a hydrophobizing section or device and a deacidifying section or device.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., a divided fluidization vessel) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Additionally, applicant recognizes, on page 7, second sentence under the heading "*Distinction between Present Invention and Klebe '092*" of the remarks, that the fluidized bed reactor of Klebe conducts both hydrophobization and deacidification treatments. Therefore the fluidization vessel of Klebe has a hydrophobizing and deacidifying section, even if they both occur in one section. The mere fact that a given structure is integral does not preclude its consisting of various elements. *Nerwin v. Erlichman*, 168 USPQ 177, 179 (PTO Bd. of Int. 1969).

### ***Conclusion***

3. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1764

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alexa D. Neckel whose telephone number is 571-272-1446. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday from 9:00 AM - 7:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Caldarola can be reached on 571-272-1444. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Alexa D. Neckel  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1764

March 29, 2006

  
ALEXA DOROSHENK NECKEL  
PRIMARY EXAMINER